



JAMES A. NOYES, Director

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

900 SOUTH FREMONT AVENUE
ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91803-1331
Telephone: (626) 458-5100
www.ladpw.org

ADDRESS ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:
P.O. BOX 1460
ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91802-1460

March 20, 2003

IN REPLY PLEASE
REFER TO FILE: PD-3

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2756

Dear Supervisors:

**PICO CANYON CHANNEL STABILIZERS AND INVERT ACCESS RAMP
NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND AUTHORITY TO PROCEED
SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT 5
3 VOTES**

**IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT YOUR BOARD ACTING AS THE GOVERNING BODY OF
THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT:**

1. Consider the Negative Declaration for the Pico Canyon Channel Stabilizers and Invert Access Ramp project to modify six erosion control structures and to construct parapet walls and an invert access ramp in Pico Canyon Channel, concur that the project with the proposed mitigation measures will not have a significant effect on the environment, find that the Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment of the County, and approve the Negative Declaration.
2. Adopt the enclosed Reporting Program to ensure compliance with the project and conditions adopted to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment.
3. Approve the project and authorize Public Works to carry out the project.
4. Authorize Public Works to pay the \$1,250 fee to the State Department of Fish and Game as required by the Fish and Game and Public Resources Codes.

PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION

The purpose of the proposed project is to improve access for maintenance of the channel and also to enhance the level of flood protection. The proposed project is located in the City of Santa Clarita and it involves the construction of 45-foot by 35-foot-long overpour basins and channel access ramps at each structure which are downstream of the existing erosion control structures. Two-foot-high parapet walls will be constructed at the basins to accommodate the design flow. The existing 36-inch grouted riprap under the Tournament Road bridge will be removed and replaced with reinforced concrete. In addition, an approximately 340-foot by 15-foot-wide reinforced concrete invert access ramp will be aligned from an existing stabilizer to the existing access road upstream of Tournament Road.

An environmental impact analysis/documentation is a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirement that is to be used in evaluating the environmental impacts of this project and should be considered in the approval of this project. As the project administrator, we are also the lead agency in terms of meeting the requirements of the CEQA.

The Initial Study of Environmental Factors indicated that the proposed project would not have a significant effect on the environment. In accordance with the Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines adopted by your Board on November 17, 1987, a Negative Declaration (ND) was prepared and circulated for public review.

Implementation of Strategic Plan Goals

This action is consistent with the County Strategic Plan Goal of Service Excellence as it allows us to maintain a portion of the regional flood control system, thereby improving the quality of life in the County.

FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING

The project is included in the Fiscal Year 2002-03 Flood Control District Construction program. The estimated cost of the project is \$1,500,000. A construction contract is anticipated to be advertised for bids at a later date, contingent on your approval of this action.

FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

Under the CEQA, any lead agency preparing an ND must provide a public notice within a reasonable period of time prior to certification of the ND. To comply with this requirement, a Public Notice, pursuant to Section 21092 of the Public Resources Code, was published in the *Daily News of Los Angeles* on November 25, 2002. Copies of the ND were sent to the Valencia Library for public review. Notices were also mailed to residents in the vicinity of the project.

Comments were received during the public review period from the California Departments of Transportation and Fish and Game. The responses to those comments are included in Attachment B of the ND.

Based upon the Initial Study of Environmental Factors, the ND determined that the project with necessary mitigation measures will not have a significant effect on the environment. Therefore, approval of the ND is requested at this time.

IMPACT ON CURRENT SERVICES (OR PROJECTS)

The project would alleviate the problem of erosion and scouring in the Pico Canyon Channel.

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

The CEQA requires public agency decision makers to document and consider the environmental implications of their action.

Mitigation measures have been included as part of the project. We have prepared the enclosed Reporting and Monitoring Program that includes maintaining records to ensure compliance with environmental mitigation measures adopted as part of this project. Your Board is being asked to approve and authorize Public Works to carry out this project.

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
March 20, 2003
Page 4

A fee must be paid to the State Department of Fish and Game when certain notices required by the CEQA are filed with the County Clerk. Upon approval of the ND by your Board, Public Works will submit \$1,250 to the County Clerk to pay this fee. In addition, a \$25 handling fee will be paid to the County Clerk for processing. We will also file a Notice of Determination in accordance with the requirements of Section 21152(a) of the California Public Resources Code.

CONCLUSION

Please return one approved copy of this letter to us.

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES A. NOYES
Director of Public Works

SDS:ph
C031491
A:\Pico Canyon.wpd

Enc.

cc: Chief Administrative Office
County Counsel

**PROGRAM FOR REPORTING AND MONITORING THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
MITIGATION MEASURES**

PICO CANYON CHANNEL STABILIZERS AND INVERT ACCESS RAMP

The following program will be used to monitor and implement the mitigation measures discussed in Section XVIII of the Negative Declaration.

1.0 Program Management

- 1.1 After adoption of environmental mitigation measures by the Board of Supervisors, the Department of Public Works shall designate responsibility for monitoring and reporting compliance with each mitigation measure.
- 1.2 To facilitate implementation and enforcement of this program, Public Works shall ensure that the obligation to monitor and report compliance with environmental mitigation measures is required by all project-related contracts between the County and consultant, prime construction contractor, and any other person or entity who is designated to monitor and/or report compliance under this program during the preconstruction and construction phases.
- 1.3 Public Works, as appropriate, shall take all necessary and appropriate measures to ensure that each project-related environmental mitigation measure, which was adopted, is implemented and maintained.

2.0 Preconstruction

- 2.1 Public Works or consultant for project design is responsible for incorporating mitigation measures into the project design and confirming in writing that final construction drawings include all design-related mitigation measures.
- 2.2 Public Works or consultant for design of project-related off-site improvements is responsible for incorporating mitigation measures and confirming in writing that final construction drawings include all design-related mitigation measures.

3.0 Construction

- 3.1 Public Works or the prime construction contractor for project and/or for project-related off-site improvements is responsible for constructing and/or monitoring the construction of mitigation measures incorporated in final construction documents and reporting instances of noncompliance in writing.

- 3.2 Public Works or prime construction contractor for project and/or for project-related off-site improvements is responsible for implementation and/or monitoring the implementation of mitigation measures affecting methods and practices of construction (e.g., hours of operation, noise control of machinery) and reporting instances of noncompliance in writing.
- 3.3 Public Works is responsible for monitoring compliance of prime construction contractor(s) with responsibility set forth in 3.1 and 3.2 above and reporting noncompliance in writing.

4.0 **Project Operation**

- 4.1 After completion and final acceptance of the project, Public Works is responsible for monitoring and maintaining compliance with adopted mitigation measures, which affect project operation.

SDS

A:\Pico Canyon.wpd

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

FOR

PICO CANYON CHANNEL STABILIZERS AND INVERT ACCESS RAMP

1. Location and Brief Description

The proposed project is located in the City of Santa Clarita. The project site extends from Tournament Road downstream to just past Wiley Canyon Road at the confluence with Santa Clara River-South Fork (see attached map). The proposed project involves the construction of 45-foot by 35-foot-long overpour basins and channel access ramps at each structure, downstream of the existing erosion control structures. Two-foot-high parapet walls will be constructed at the basins to accommodate the design flow. The existing 36-inch grouted riprap under the Tournament Road Bridge will be removed and replaced with reinforced concrete. In addition, an approximately 340-foot by 15-foot-wide reinforced concrete invert access ramp will be aligned from an existing stabilizer to the existing access road upstream of Tournament Road.

The purpose of the proposed project is to protect the levees from undermining; improve access for maintenance, inspection, and repairs of the channel reach; and also to provide flood protection.

The proposed improvements would not require right-of-way acquisition.

II. Mitigation Measures Included in the Project to Avoid Potentially Significant Effects

No significant environmental effects were identified. However, mitigation measures are discussed in Section XVIII of the Initial Study.

III. Finding of No Significant Effect

Based on the attached Initial Study, it has been determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

SDS:ph
PD-3/A:\Pico Canyon.wpd

Attach.

INITIAL STUDY OF ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

1. **Project Title:** Pico Canyon Channel Stabilizers and Invert Access Ramp
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, 900 South Fremont Avenue, Alhambra, CA 91803
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Ms. Sarah D. Scott, (626) 458-3916
4. **Project Location:** Pico Canyon Channel in the City of Santa Clarita
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, 900 South Fremont Avenue, Alhambra, CA 91803
6. **General Plan Designation:** Urban
7. **Zoning:** Low-density residential
8. **Description of Project:** The proposed project is located in the City of Santa Clarita. The project site extends from Tournament Road downstream to just past Wiley Canyon Road at the confluence with Santa Clara River-South Fork. The proposed project involves the construction of 45-foot by 35-foot-long overpour basins and channel access ramps at each structure, downstream of the existing erosion control structures. Two-foot-high parapet walls will be constructed at the basins to accommodate the design flow. The existing 36-inch grouted riprap under the Tournament Road Bridge will be removed and replaced with reinforced concrete. In addition, an approximately 340-foot by 15-foot-wide reinforced concrete invert access ramp will be aligned from an existing stabilizer to the existing access road upstream of Tournament Road.
9. **Surrounding Land Use and Settings:**
 - A. **Project Site** - The project site is located in Pico Canyon Channel, which is east of Vista Valencia Golf Course, west of Orchard Village Road, and north of Sarda Road. The channel has 1-1/2:1 reinforced concrete side slopes. The site contains cattails, some riparian herb species, and ornamental vegetation.
 - B. **Surrounding Properties** - The area north, south, and east of the project is low-density residential, and the area west of the project is recreational. Animal life in the surrounding area would include urban-adapted species such as opossum, racoon, and possibly coyote. Species observed included birds, lizards, and squirrels. No known endangered species or species of special concern are expected to occur within the project limits.
10. **Other agencies whose approval is required (and permits needed):**
 - A. United States Army Corps of Engineers - Section 404 Permit
 - B. Regional Water Quality Control Board - Section 401 Permit
 - C. California Department of Fish and Game - 1601 Streambed Alteration Agreement

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

<input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality
<input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils
<input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning
<input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Noise	<input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing
<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation	<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic
<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems	<input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance	

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☒ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project would have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Sarah D. Scott
Printed Name

9-19-02
Date

LACDPW
For

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) "Potential Significant Impact" is appropriate if an effect is significant or potentially significant, or if the lead agency lacks information to make a finding of insignificance. If there are one or more "Potential Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.
- 4) "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potential Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVIII, "Earlier Analysis," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR or other California Environmental Quality Act process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section XVIII at the end of the checklist.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). See the sample question below. A source list should be attached and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

PICO CANYON CHANNEL STABILIZERS AND INVERT ACCESS RAMP

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

		Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. <u>AESTHETICS</u> - Would the project:					
	a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			X
	b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?			X
	c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?		X	
	d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X
II. <u>AGRICULTURE RESOURCES</u> - In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:					
	a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?			X
	b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?			X
	c)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use?			X

		Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY - Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:					
	a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X
	b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X
	c)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for zone precursors)?			X
	d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?		X	
	e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?		X	
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the project:					
	a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		X	
	b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		X	
	c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on Federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?		X	

		Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident, migratory fish, or wildlife species; or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors; or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?		X	
	e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			X
	f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan; Natural Community Conservation Plan; or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?			X
V. <u>CULTURAL RESOURCES</u> - Would the project:					
	a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?			X
	b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?			X
	c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X
	d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			X
VI. <u>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</u> - Would the project:					
	a)	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			
	i)	Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a know fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			X
	ii)	Strong seismic ground shaking?			X
	iii)	Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X
	iv)	Landslides?			X

			Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				X
	c)	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?				X
	d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				X
	e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the project:

	a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				X
	b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X	
	c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			X	
	d)	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code, Section 65962.5, and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
	e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
	f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X

			Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	g)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
	h)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				X
VIII. <u>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</u> - Would the project:						
	a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				X
	b)	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			X	
	c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			X	
	d)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X	
	e)	Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				X
	f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				X
	g)	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
	h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?			X	

			Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	i)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
	j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:						
	a)	Physically divide an established community?				X
	b)	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of any agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
	c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X
X. MINERAL RESOURCES - Would the project:						
	a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
	b)	Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?				X
XI. NOISE - Would the project result in:						
	a)	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
	b)	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				X
	c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
	d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	

			Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
	f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING - Would the project:						
	a)	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X
	b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
	c)	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES -						
	a)	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
		Fire protection?				X
		Police protection?				X
		Schools?				X
		Parks?				X
		Other public facilities?				X

		Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. <u>RECREATION</u> -					
	a)	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			X
	b)	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			X
XV. <u>TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</u> - Would the project:					
	a)	Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?		X	
	b)	Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County Congestion Management Agency for designated roads or highways?			X
	c)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?			X
	d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X
	e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?			X
	f)	Result in inadequate parking capacity?			X
	g)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?			X
XVI. <u>UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</u> - Would the project:					
	a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			X
	b)	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X

			Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	c)	Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
	d)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X
	e)	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
	f)	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				X
	g)	Comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE -						
	a)	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				X
	b)	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively Considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)				X

			Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	c)	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				X

XVIII. DISCUSSION OF WAYS TO MITIGATE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS -

Section 15041 (a) of the State CEQA guidelines states that a lead agency for a project has authority to require changes in any or all activities involved in the project in order to lessen or avoid significant effects on the environment. No significant effects have been identified. However, the following mitigation measures have been included:

Air Quality

- Control dust by appropriate means such as watering and/or sweeping.
- Compliance with applicable air pollution control regulations.

Geology and Soils

- Proper removal and disposal of excess soils and excavated materials.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- Proper maintenance of all construction equipment.
- Compliance with all applicable laws and ordinances regarding chemical cleanup.

Hydrology and Water Quality

- Compliance with all applicable Best Management Practices as required by the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit issued to the County by the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Noise

- Compliance with all applicable noise and ordinances during construction.
- Construction activities would be restricted to the County appointed construction times.

Transportation/Traffic

- Advance notification of all street and/or lane closures and detours to all emergency service agencies.
- Clear delineations and barricades to designate through-traffic lanes.
- Compliance with all applicable laws and ordinances regarding the transportation routes for the haul of material.

ATTACHMENT A
DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS
PICO CANYON CHANNEL STABILIZERS AND INVERT ACCESS RAMP

I. AESTHETICS - Would the project:

a) *Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*

No impact. The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on the scenic vista.

b) *Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?*

No impact. The proposed project will not damage trees, rock outcroppings, historic buildings, or any other scenic resources within a State scenic highway.

c) *Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?*

Less than significant impact. The proposed project will include overpour basins, parapet walls, and access ramps. The new structure would impact the visual character of the site because the walls will be visible. The project will not alter the characteristics of the project area from the surrounding area therefore, the impact will be less than significant.

d) *Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?*

No impact. The project does not include any additional lighting systems. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on day or nighttime views in the area.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES - In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

- a) *Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?***

No impact. The location of the proposed project is not used for agricultural purposes nor as farmland. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on the conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use.

- b) *Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?***

No impact. The proposed project will not conflict with a Williamson Act contract. The proposed project will not impact any existing zoning for agricultural use.

- c) *Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use?***

No impact. The proposed project does not involve changes in the existing environment that could result in the conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use.

III. AIR QUALITY - Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

- a) *Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?***

No impact. The County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works currently complies with dust control measures enforced by the South Coast Air Quality Management District. Therefore, the proposed project will not conflict with the current implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

- b) *Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?***

No impact. The proposed project would not contribute significantly to an existing or projected air quality violation. Therefore, the proposed project would not violate air quality standards.

- c) ***Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?***

No impact. The proposed project will neither result in a permanent increase in vehicle trips to the project location nor lead to emissions which exceed thresholds for ozone precursors. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on ambient air quality standards.

- d) ***Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?***

Less than significant impact. The proposed project may create small amounts of dust from the construction and pollution from diesel trucks. However, project construction will be short-term. Therefore, the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations would be less than significant.

- e) ***Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?***

Less than significant impact. Objectionable odors may be generated from diesel trucks during construction activities. Project construction would be short-term and temporary. Thus, the impact of the proposed project from objectionable odors is considered less than significant.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the project:

- a) ***Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?***

Less than significant impact. No sensitive or special status plant or wildlife species, as identified by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, are expected to occur on the project site due to the lack of suitable habitat. Therefore, the proposed project will have a less than significant impact.

- b) ***Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?***

Less than significant impact. A biological survey¹ identified that the proposed project site does support some riparian herbs. However, due to the lack of suitable habitat, the proposed project is not expected to have a substantial impact on special status plant and wildlife species.

- c) ***Have a substantial adverse effect on Federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?***

Less than significant impact. The proposed project is not a known wetland habitat. However, a United States Army Corps Nationwide permit will be obtained for this project prior to construction. Therefore, the proposed project impact on federally-protected wetland habitats is considered less than significant.

- d) ***Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?***

Less than significant impact. Even though the proposed project would require construction in the channel, the channel is not considered a migratory wildlife corridor, therefore, the proposed project impact on wildlife corridors is considered less than significant.

- e) ***Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?***

No impact. The proposed project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

- f) ***Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?***

No impact. The proposed project will not conflict with provisions of a Habitat Conservation, Natural Community Conservation, or any other habitat conservation plans.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:

¹ Bonterra Consulting September 3, 2002, Biological Constraints Survey

- a-d) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource, directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, site or geologic feature, or disturb any human remains, including those interred outside formal cemeteries?**

No impact. No known historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources exist in the project area. However, if any cultural resources, including human remains, are discovered during construction, the contractor will cease all construction activities and contact a specialist to examine the project sites as required by project specifications. Thus, the effects of the proposed project on these resources are not considered significant.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:

- a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:**

- i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.**

No impact. There are no known active faults underlying the project site, and the nearest active fault trace² is approximately two miles away; therefore, a fault rupture occurring at the project site would not be anticipated.

- ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?**

No impact. The project area has not been the epicenter of any known earthquake. The activities related to the project will not trigger strong seismic ground shaking.

- iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?**

No impact. The project area is not known to have suffered any liquefaction nor has it been identified as a potential liquefaction area. Thus, the proposed project will have no impact on liquefaction.

- iv) Landslides?**

²State of California Earthquake Fault Zones Newhall Quadrangle Revised Official Map Effective: June 1, 1995

No impact. The proposed project will have no impact exposing people or structures to landslides.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

No impact. The proposed project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. The purpose of the project is to provide erosion control and prevent further scouring of the channel lining. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on soil erosion and the loss of topsoil.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

No impact. The proposed project site is not known to be on soil that is unstable or would become unstable as a result of the project.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

No impact. The soil at the proposed project location is not considered expansive. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact by creating significant risk to life or property.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

No impact. There are no septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems at the proposed project site. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

No impact. The proposed project does not involve the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

- b-c) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment or emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances or wastes within one quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?**

Less than significant impact. Combustible engine fluids from the construction equipment are potentially hazardous substances. Necessary precautions will be taken to prevent the spillage of any hazardous substances that may affect the public or the environment at the project site. It is unlikely that an explosion, emission, or release of hazardous or acutely hazardous substances will occur as a result of the proposed project. Project specifications would require the contractor to properly maintain all equipment during construction. In the event of any spills of fluids, the contractor is required to remediate according to all applicable laws regarding chemical cleanups, and the nearby school officials would be notified of the spill and any precautions to be taken. Thus, the proposed project impact on the public or the environment is considered less than significant.

- d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code, Section 65962.5, and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?**

No impact. The proposed project site is not known to be located on a listed hazardous material site.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?**

No impact. The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan nor within two miles of a public use airport. Thus, the proposed project will not result in safety hazards for people residing or working in the project area.

- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?**

No impact. The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Thus, the proposed project will not result in safety hazards for people residing or working in the project area.

- g) *Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?***

No impact. The proposed project site is located outside the public street and would not interfere with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

- h) *Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?***

No impact. The proposed project would not expose people or structures to any significant risks involving wildland fires. Therefore, the proposed project is not expected to result in adverse impacts related to risks associated with wildland fires.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:

- a) *Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?***

No impact. The contractor is required to implement Best Management Practices as required by the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit issued to the County by the Regional Water Quality Control Board to minimize construction impacts on water quality. Therefore, the project will have no impact on the water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

- b) *Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?***

Less than significant impact. The proposed project would not involve the use of any water that would result in a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. The proposed project will be constructed in the dry season when there is little or no water in the channel. However, if there is any water in the channel during construction, it will be diverted away from the project site. Therefore, the proposed project will have less than significant impact on groundwater supplies or groundwater recharge.

- c) *Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?***

Less than significant impact. The proposed project would require construction of overpour basins, which will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the project site. The construction of the basins will protect the levees from undermining, prevent existing erosion, and will significantly reduce long-term maintenance. Therefore, the proposed project will be beneficial and have no impact on substantial erosion or siltation on or off the project site.

- d) ***Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?***

Less than significant impact. The construction activities would slightly change the topography. However, this will not significantly alter the existing drainage pattern including the course of flow or the amount of surface runoff. The purpose of the proposed project is to provide flood protection and erosion control to the channel and surrounding properties. Therefore, the proposed project impact on the existing drainage pattern of the site is considered less than significant.

- e) ***Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?***

No impact. The construction of the proposed project will not result in additional surface water runoff. The contractor will take precautions to ensure that any hazardous chemical spills are properly cleaned up. Thus, the proposed project will have no impact on the capacity of the stormwater drainage systems and will not provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.

- f) ***Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?***

No impact. The proposed project will not impact or degrade water quality.

- g) ***Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?***

No impact. Existing flood hazards are established by the Federal Emergency Management Agency. According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Flood Insurance Rate Map³ Community-Panel No. 065043 0460 B, the proposed project site is located in Flood Hazard Zone "C." A Flood Hazard Zone "C" is defined by Federal Emergency Management Agency as an area of minimal flooding. Implementation of the proposed project will not place any housing within a 100-year flood hazard area.

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

Less than significant impact. Construction of the proposed basins will slow the rate of flood flow to increase silt build up and lessen scouring of the channel bottom. The project is beneficial since it provides erosion control in the channel and, therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

No impact. The proposed project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding.

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

No impact. The proposed project will not expose people or structures to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

No impact. The proposed project will not physically divide an established community.

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinances) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

³ Community-Panel Number 065043 0460 B dated December 2, 1980

No impact. The proposed project does not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of agencies with jurisdiction over the project.

- c) ***Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?***

No impact. The proposed project will not conflict with habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES - Would the project:

- a) ***Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?***

No impact. The construction of the proposed project would not deplete any known mineral resources. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact resulting in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource.

- b) ***Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?***

No impact. The project site is not identified as a mineral resource recovery site in the local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on locally-important mineral resource recovery sites.

XI. NOISE - Would the project result in:

- a) ***Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?***

Less than significant impact. Noise levels within the proposed project site will increase during construction. However, the impact is temporary and will be subject to existing noise ordinances and standards set by U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration. The contractor will be required to comply with the construction hours specified in the County and/or City of Santa Clarita noise control ordinances. Overall, since the construction period will last for a short period, the project would not expose people to severe noise levels. Thus, the impact of severe noise levels is considered less than significant.

b) *Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?*

No impact. The project would not generate excessive groundborne vibration or noise. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on the exposure of persons to groundborne noise and vibration.

c) *A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.*

No impact. There will be no substantial permanent increase in the ambient noise level due to the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on permanent noise increases.

d) *A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?*

Less than significant impact. During the construction phase of the project, there will be a nominal increase in existing noise levels due to construction and transportation of material to and from the project site. Construction activities will be limited to normal County and/or City-regulated hours. Due to the short-term nature of the project, the impact from ambient noise levels will be less than significant.

e-f) *For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels or for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?*

No impact. The proposed project will neither be located within an airport land use plan nor within two miles of a public use airport.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING - Would the project:

a) *Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?*

No impact. The proposed project will not induce a population growth, either directly or indirectly. Therefore, the project will not induce a significant population growth.

- b-c) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, or displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?***

No impact. The proposed project will not displace existing houses or people, creating a demand for replacement housing. Therefore, the project will have no impact on the construction of replacement housing.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICE - Would the project:

- a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, other public facilities?***

No impact. The project will not affect public service and will not result in a need for new or altered governmental services in fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities. The project will not have an impact on fire or police protection services as a result of new or physically-altered governmental facilities.

XIV. RECREATION - Would the project:

- a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?***

No impact. The proposed project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks.

- b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?***

No impact. The proposed project does not include recreational facilities and does not require the construction or expansion of any recreational facilities.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC - Would the project:

- a) *Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?***

Less than significant impact. The proposed project will require transportation of construction equipment and materials to the project site. This could minimally increase the existing traffic. However, the impact would be only during construction of the proposed project and is, therefore, temporary. Thus, the impact of the proposed project on substantial traffic increases is considered to be less than significant.

- b) *Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County Congestion Management Agency for designated roads or highways?***

No impact. The proposed project will not exceed a level of service standard established by the County Congestion Management Agency for roads or highways in the project area.

- c) *Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location, that results in substantial safety risks?***

No impact. The proposed project will have no impact on air traffic patterns.

- d) *Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?***

No impact. The proposed project does not involve any design features or incompatible uses constituting safety hazards.

- e) *Result in inadequate emergency access?***

No impact. The proposed project is located within the channel and, therefore, will have no impact on emergency access.

- f) *Result in inadequate parking capacity?***

No impact. The proposed project will not result in the need for more parking. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on parking capacity.

- g) ***Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?***

No impact. The proposed project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the project:

- a) ***Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable RWQCB?***

No impact. The project will not result in contamination or an increase in discharge of wastewater that might affect wastewater treatment. Thus, the proposed project will have no impact on the wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

- b) ***Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?***

No impact. The proposed project will not require the construction or expansion of new water or wastewater treatment facilities.

- c) ***Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?***

No impact. The proposed project will not require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities. The existing drainage facilities will accommodate the proposed construction.

- d) ***Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?***

No impact. The proposed project will not result in a need for additional water entitlements. Therefore, the project will have no impact on existing water resources.

- e) ***Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?***

No impact. No significant increase in the amount of wastewater discharged will occur as a result of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on wastewater treatment capacity.

- f) ***Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?***

No impact. The proposed project will not generate any significant amount of solid waste. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on landfill capacity.

- g) ***Comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?***

No impact. The project would comply with all Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE - Would the project:

- a) ***Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?***

No impact. Based on findings in this environmental review, the proposed project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish and wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of California history.

- b) ***Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects?)***

No impact. The proposed project would not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.

- c) ***Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?***

No impact. The proposed project would not have a direct or indirect detrimental environmental impact on human beings.

A:\Pico Canyon.wpd

ATTACHMENT B

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO WRITTEN COMMENTS

RECEIVED ON THE INITIAL STUDY AND NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Presented below is a response to a written comment received during circulation for the Initial Study/Negative Declaration regarding the proposed Verdugo Debris Basin Retaining Wall project. Response to comments that raise environmental issues, as required by the State of California Environmental Quality Act guidelines. A copy of the letter received is included on the following page.

Response to letter of comment received from California Department of Transportation

- 1-2 The contractor will be required by the project specifications to obtain all necessary permits from Caltrans. When possible, the use of oversized loads on State highway will be limited to off-peak hours.

Response to letter of comment received from California Department of Fish and Game

- 2-1 The hiring of a qualified biologist will be included in contract specifications to insure that the proposed construction activities will not result in the disturbances to native and non-native vegetation and man-made nesting substrates, including disturbances which would cause abandonment of active nests containing eggs and/or young.
- 2-2 The biologist will be required to conduct preconstruction surveys to determine the presence or non-presence of bats or nurseries in the project area.
- 2-3 A Streambed Alteration Agreement application will be submitted to the Department of Fish and Game upon approval of the document. A 1:1 replacement for habitat will be proposed.